

DEPUTY CLERK

¹ Blocker complains that his meals often include old cabbage, undercooked bread and cookies, too-small pieces of cake, suspicious-smelling coffee, slimy potatoes, beans and rice that have been “played with,” and various bodily fluids.

of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277–78 (4th Cir. 1985). Still, the relaxation of the pleading rules is not without limits. A court must, at a minimum, be able to discern from the complaint the parties being sued and the alleged conduct on which each claim rests. Though relaxed, the standard still demands general coherence, and it does not require courts “to conjure up questions never squarely presented to them.” Id. at 1278.

Here (as with his previous complaint²) Blocker has alleged a number of wrongs but offered scant factual support for them, largely failed to connect any particular wrong to any particular defendant, neglected to ground his complaint on any constitutional or statutory provision, and requested no specific relief. While the pleading rules do not impose an exacting standard on Blocker, he must offer some foothold on which the defendants can base an answer or on which the court can base a judgment. Accordingly, the court dismisses Blocker’s complaint without prejudice for failure to state a claim.

ENTER: April 25, 2013.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² See Blocker v. Virginia State Prison Officials, W.R.S.P., 7:13cv00027 (W.D. Va. January 24, 2013).